

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,053	07/10/2003	Bob Ching	CSC-023443-US	4311
1726 7	590 08/03/2006		EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY			FORTUNA, JOSE A	
LOVELAND,	GE BOULEVARD OH 45140		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ŕ			1731	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/618,053	CHING ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	José A. Fortuna	1731			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 Ma 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. Ice except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-2, 7-8, 12-16, 19-22, 24-33 is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ○ Claim(s) 1,2,7,8,12-16,19-22 and 24-33 is/are reconstruction of the specification is objected to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) □ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ○ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2003 is/are: a) ○ Applicant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the or are subjected to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request that any objection to the specificant may not request the specificant	rejected. rejection requirement. I accepted or b) □ objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		7.00.017 01 1011111 1 0 102.			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some col None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	`			

Art Unit: 1731

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 12-16, 19-22 and 24-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The use of Platy Kaolin critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). Applicants admit in the arguments filed on May 26, 2006 that the use of Platy kaolin is critical to the invention, at least to obtain the caliper preservation and the caliper/Bulk ratio claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

Page 3

Claims 1-2, 7-8, 12-16, 19-22 and 24-33 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a). This rejection is set forth in the prior Office action mailed on January 26, 2006.

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on May 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that the cited references do not teach the caliper/bulk ratio, as it is know claimed and that none of them teach the criticality of using Platy Kaolin as the pigment. Yet the caliper to bulk ratio claimed is only obtained with the use of Platy Kaolin as the pigment and the claims, except for claims 13-15 and 26, do not teach the use of the presumably critical element.

Applicants argue unexpected results, but have not presented enough evidence(s) of this fact, i.e., why it would be unexpected to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, the rejection for the claims containing the Platy Kaolin, the critical element, is maintained until more data are supplied to clearly show the unexpected results. That is, it is the examiner's opinion that optimizing the caliper to bulk ratio to desired levels would have

Art Unit: 1731

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as an optimization of a result effective variable. It has been held that "[T]he discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art. *In re Antoine*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977); *In re Aller*, 42 CCPA 824, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (1995).

Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure in the art of "Making High Bulk Coated Papers."
- 6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José A. Fortuna whose telephone number is 571-272-1188. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 1731

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P. Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1731